

REMARKS

At the outset, the Applicants wish to thank Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) Terrel Morris for the many courtesies extended to the undersigned attorney during the Personal Interview on June 30, 2004, at the U.S.P.T.O. The substance of this Personal Interview is set forth in the Examiner Interview Summary, and in this Amendment.

The amendments to this patent application are as follows. The Specification on Page 7 has been amended in order to correct a minor typographical error. The claims have been amended as follows.

Independent claim 15 has been amended in order to delete the term "exclusively". Also, the phrase "mechanically anchored" has been defined by the language added to claim 15 "wherein being mechanically anchored is that said pile threads are guided around adjacent weft threads and cut off."

In addition, in claim 15, the term "curled" has been cancelled, and the word "crimped" has been added and substituted therefor. The word "crimped" is found on pages 5, 6 and 8 of the present Specification.

Reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested for the rejection of Claims 15-28 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. As noted in the Advisory Action of June 7, 2004, and as discussed in the Personal Interview of June 30, 2004, the limitation of "exclusively" is considered a negative limitation that does not find support in the Specification. As such, it is considered new matter. Also as discussed during the Personal Interview, it was suggested that the Applicant amend the claims to positively recite the nature of "mechanically anchored" and to cancel the negative limitation "exclusively". As discussed above, these revisions were made to claim 15.

Reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested for the rejection of Claims 15-28 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing new matter based upon the term "curled". As noted in said Advisory Action, the Specification teaches that the fibers may be "crimped", but the scope of "crimped" and "curled" are allegedly not equivalent. Thus, claims 15-28 were rejected for containing new matter. Therefore, the term "curled" was cancelled and has been replaced by the word "crimped" in claim 15, as discussed above.

For all these reasons, all the claims are now in complete compliance with all of the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112. Withdrawal of this ground of rejection is respectfully requested.

During the Personal Interview on June 30, 2004, there was a discussion of the Final Office Action dated December 11, 2003, and specifically a discussion of the *Shimono U.S. Patent No. 5,887,416* and of *U.S. Patent No. 6,057,023*.

Shimono, 5,887,416 in column 2, in lines 20 to 21 teaches that the pile yarn is subjected to tufting. In column 2, in lines 55 to 60, *Shimono* teaches that the pile yarn 1a is tufted onto a base cloth 2 by a tufting machine. Then the pile yarn 1a is fixed by a bonding agent such as a latex 4 onto the base cloth 2.

Shimono 6,057,023 in column 4, in lines 9 to 15 discloses that the pile yarn 1 is tufted onto a base cloth 2 by a tufting machine, and the entire or a part of it is subjected to a cut piling, and then the pile yarn 1 is fixed by a bonding agent such as a latex 4, as occasion demands, onto a non-piled surface of the base cloth 2. The pile yarn 1 tufted onto the base cloth 2 is secured to a rubber sheet 3. The mat of FIG. 1 is prepared by this process.

Claim 15 has now been amended to recite that the pile threads are mechanically anchored and to recite "wherein being mechanically anchored is that said pile threads are guided around adjacent weft threads and cut off". This distinguishes over the use of a bonding agent in the *Shimono* references, and it is also distinguishes over these tufted structures and products of the prior art references.

During the Personal Interview, it was agreed that by defining the nature of the mechanically anchored structure as discussed above, that this would overcome the prior art rejections of record.

For all these reasons, the prior art fails to provide an identical disclosure of the claimed invention. Hence, the present invention is not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102. Withdrawal of this ground of rejection, as discussed during the Personal Interview, is respectfully requested.

In summary, Claim 15 has been amended, and claims 15 to 28 are pending. In view of these amendments, it is firmly believed that the present invention, and all the claims, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103, as discussed during the Personal Interview,

over all the prior art applied by the Patent Examiner.


Withdrawal of this ground of rejection is respectfully requested.

A prompt notification of allowability is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

GREGOR KOHLRUSS ET AL

COLLARD & ROE, P.C.
1077 Northern Boulevard
Roslyn, New York 11576
(516) 365-9802

By: 
Allison C. Collard, Reg. No. 22,532
Edward R. Freedman, Reg. No. 26,048
Attorneys for Applicant

Enclosure: Copy of Petition for 2 month Extension of Time (Small Entity)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on January 20, 2005.



MARIA GUASTELLA